

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/511,898
Attorney Docket No. Q83178

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Submitted herewith please find one replacement drawing sheet in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt of these drawings. The submitted drawings are intended to replace the drawings previously submitted on October 20, 2004.

Attachment: One Replacement Drawing Sheet.

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are all of the claims pending in the application. Claims 15-19 are newly added. Applicant respectfully submits that all new claims are sufficiently supported by the original disclosure, and that no impermissible new matter has been introduced.

I. Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because they do not show a legend for clarification. Accordingly, Applicant has added labels to certain portions of the drawings for clarification. Replacement drawing sheets in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84 are attached. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

II. Specification

The Examiner has noted that the specification lacked certain section headings. The specification has been modified by adding section headings as set forth above in the interest of greater clarity. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these objections.

III. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-14 due to alleged informalities. The informalities noted by the Examiner have been corrected as set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these objections.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections based on the self-explanatory claim amendments set forth above.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,704,873 B1 to Underwood (“Underwood”). Of these claims, only claims 1 and 9 are independent. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

According to the MPEP, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” (MPEP § 2131.) Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-14 and new claims 15-18 positively recite limitations which are not taught by Underwood.

A. Claims 1-8

Claim 1 requires “a first table storing sets of at least one primary rule, called ‘primary metarules’, in a parameterizable form and in corresponding relationship to primary identifiers.” The portion of Underwood cited by the Examiner in relation to this element of claim 1 teaches that “Codes Table Services enable applications to utilize externally stored parameters and validation rules.” (Underwood at Col. 116, lines 47-50.)

Although this portion of Underwood appears to teach a generic lookup table service, this portion of Underwood does not teach a table storing “sets of at least one . . . rule . . . in a parameterizable form,” as required by claim 1. For example, Underwood discloses that “[t]he role of this framework is to store frequently used code/decode sets on the web server and provide services that enable the application developer to retrieve the decode(s) associated with code(s).” (Underwood at Cols. 17-18, lines 65-1.)

Claim 1 further requires the following:

management means adapted to be coupled to said control means and, on receipt of auxiliary data representing operating parameters delivered by said control means after reception by the server of secondary data, to select at least one of the primary identifiers in the first table and associate said auxiliary data therewith so as to define said dedicated processes.

The Examiner has read the foregoing requirements of claim 1 on the “Codes Table Services” of Underwood regarding the “first table” of claim 1. (Office Action at 6, citing Underwood, Col. 116, lines 47-50.) However, Underwood does not describe the selection of anything akin to the “primary identifiers” of claim 1 in “Codes Table Services” by the “Managing Hardware” or the “Active User Object (AUO).” Underwood also fails to describe in relation to “Codes Table Services” the requirement of claim 1 to “associate said auxiliary data therewith so as to define said dedicated processes.” (Underwood, Col. 127, lines 58-64; Col.

137, lines 8-11; Cols. 139 and 140, lines 47-54 and 7-10.) Thus, the portions of Underwood cited by the Examiner fail to teach all required elements of claim 1.

Furthermore, dependent claim 8 (i.e., 8/1) requires a “firewall.” The portions of Underwood cited by the Examiner fail to teach a “firewall comprising a device according to claim 1,” as required by amended claim 8.

For at least the above exemplary reasons, Underwood fails to anticipate independent claim 1 or its dependent claims 2-8; thus, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 9-14

Regarding claim 9, please see Applicant’s comments above regarding claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant’s comments regarding claim 1 also traverse the Examiner’s rejection of independent claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-14 for reasons analogous to those presented above; thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection of claims 9-14.

Applicant also respectfully submits that new claims 15-18 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art, in view of the comments presented above with respect to the rejections based on Underwood.

VI. New Claims 15-18

New claim 15 and its dependent claim 16 are respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the prior art at least in view of their requirement for “at least one

parameterized rule,” in view of the comments presented above with respect to the rejections based on Underwood.

New claim 17 is respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the prior art at least in view of its requirement for “primary identifiers, each with one or more associated parameterized rules,” in view of the comments presented above with respect to the rejections based on Underwood.

Finally, new claim 18 is also respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the prior art at least in view of its requirement for “first primary identifiers, each with one or more associated parameterized rules,” in view of the comments presented above with respect to the rejections based on Underwood.

VII. Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant herewith petitions the Director of the USPTO to extend the time for reply to the above-identified Office Action for an appropriate length of time if necessary. Unless a check is attached, any fee due under 37 U.S.C. § 1.17(a) is being paid via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS). The USPTO is also directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/511,898
Attorney Docket No. Q83178

the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kelly G. Nyndman
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 11, 2006